DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 186 SO 002 767

AUTHOR Longaker, Richard; Cleary, Robert
TITLE Report on Evaluation of Pilot Civics Institutes, NDEA 1966.
INSTITUTION Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 66
CONTRACT OEC-2-6-001005-1005
NOTE 12p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS American Government (Course); Citizenship; *Civics; Elementary School Teachers; Evaluation; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Pilot Projects; *Political Science; Secondary School Teachers; *Summer Institutes
IDENTIFIERS NDEA Title XI

ABSTRACT

This report is one of a series presenting the results of studies of NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities Foundation institute programs and selected institute-associated activities conducted in 1966. During the summer of 1966 five pilot Institutes in Civics were funded by the Office of Education. The purpose was to utilize the initial experience for the improvement of civics institutes expected in greater numbers in subsequent years. There is no doubt that the pilot institutes served this function. This report includes: 1) an evaluation of these pilot institutes; 2) specific suggestions for improvements which might be adopted in the years ahead; and, 3) a discussion of some of the more profound background questions which emerge not only from the institute experience but which are also inherent in the problems of civic education. The five institutes served a total of 190 social studies teachers.
(Author/JLB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 010706

REPORT ON

EVALUATION OF PILOT CIVICS INSTITUTES, NDEA 1966

By

Professor Richard Longaker
Political Science Department
University of California
Los Angeles, California

and

Professor Robert Cleary
American Political Science Association
Washington, D.C.

CoNpass

1966

FOREWARD

This report is one of a series presenting the results of studies of NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities Foundation institute programs and selected institute-associated activities conducted in 1966 by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS) for the U.S. Office of Education under Contract No. OEC2-6-001005-1005 and four subcontracts.

The Consortium was formed in May 1966 by the five associations which assessed the 1965 Title XI institute program – the American Historical Association, the Association of American Geographers, the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (NEA), the International Reading Association, and the Modern Language Association of America. Invitations to membership were subsequently extended to, and accepted by, the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association. Four members at large provide liaison with the arts and humanities, psychological tests and measurement, educational psychology, and teacher education specialists.

The objectives of CONPASS are to: provide a coordinated assessment of the effectiveness and impacts of institutes and other types of special teacher training programs; propose means of improving such programs; and provide a medium for dialogue among the professional associations and leading scholars of the several subject content disciplines and fields represented on its Board. These reports constitute a portion of the program developed to fulfill those objectives. It is hoped that they will prove useful to educators in general as well as to directors and prospective directors of institutes, officers of the U.S. Office of Education, and legislators and administrative officials of the Federal and States' Governments in their joint efforts to improve the quality of American education at all levels.

We take this opportunity to thank the consultants who conducted the studies and authored these reports for their diligent and conscientious performance of complex and exacting assignments.

Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Chairman William H. Wake, Director

PREFACE

During the summer of 1966 five pilot Institutes in Civics were funded by the Office of Education. The purpose was to utilize the initial experience for the improvement of civics institutes expected in greater numbers in subsequent years. There is no doubt that the pilot institutes have served this function.

What follows is (1) an evaluation of the pilot institutes held in the summer of 1966, (2) specific suggestions for improvements which might be adopted in the years ahead, and (3) a discussion of some of the more profound background questions which emerge not only from the institute experience but which are also inherent in the problem of civic education.

In common with institutes in other subject matter fields, the intent of the Office of Education was to improve the education of teachers in an area of national educational concern called civics which, it is understood, is broadly defined as the study of political science. The sample of five institutes served a total of 190 teachers in the social studies. While it is true that these teachers are only a few grains of sand in the overall topography of civic education, there is one very evident conclusion that can be drawn from the summer programs; it is, that the teachers are woefully undereducated and, among the sample during the summer of 1966 at least, highly motivated to overcome their undereducation. If there is one lesson to be learned from the pilot institutes, it is that only a systematic attack will be adequate to reach the capacities of many teachers who are better than the quality of the education they received in the past.

Civic education in its most definitive sense signifies the fullest education possible of all students, K through 12, in all disciplines so that their contribution to society will be fulfilling and productive in the economic, political, and other creative spheres of life in a free society. This overall perspective should not be forgotten in what appears in this report; nevertheless, the particular perspective here is an evaluation of the use of the institute pattern to expose teachers to some of the instruments of contemporary political science so that they, in turn, might bring to their students a realistic understanding of the processes of government and the use of political power in a democratic society. It should be emphasized that the thrust toward realistic understanding of these institutions and processes points away from the wooden description of the formal structure of government and the repetitive and uncritical idealizing of a national creed which has typified civic education in the past.

CONTENTS

FOREWARD i

PREFACE iii

CONTENTS v

PART I – AN EVALUATION OF THE 1966 INSTITUTE PROGRAMS

Sites and Programs 1

Attitudes and Motivation. 1

Institute Program Deficiencies 2
- Scheduling
- Utilization of Literature
- Transfer and Translation
- Books
- Staff Articulation

Problem of Translation 3

Importance of Realistic Programming 3

PART II – PROPOSALS FOR ADJUSTMENTS IN FUTURE PROGRAMS

Continuing Education 3

Institute Distribution 4

Book Allowance 4

Problem of Translation 4
- Barriers
- Goals
- Variables
- Administrative Acceptance
- Interchange

PART III – NEED FOR HARD DATA 6

PART IV – FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS. 6

PART V – QUANTITATIVE DATA 7

PART I. AN EVALUATION OF THE 1966 INSTITUTE PROGRAMS

At the request of the Office of Education, several universities in the United States submitted proposals for pilot institutes in civics for the summer of 1966. The limited time for submission of proposals and the brief period between the announcement of the institutes and the beginning date no doubt affected, to some degree, the conception of the institutes and the possibilities of broader publicity and recruitment of students in the institutes. Nonetheless, error and debilities produced by the sense or urgency certainly were outweighed by the desirability of getting some activity going in Civics at the earliest possible moment.

Sites and Programs

The institutions which executed programs were: the University of Florida (Gainesville), the University of California (Los Angeles), Wayne State University (Detroit), Southern University (Baton Rouge) and Columbia University (New York), UCLA's program was the only program aimed at the elementary school level, all others were offered to teachers in secondary education. The programs were various and represented both the interests and the expertise of the staffs at the institutions in question. The most conventional in a programmatic sense was Southern University which emphasized American government and political processes but utilized contemporary methods of social science analysis. The program at the University of Florida utilized a theme of political development; the Wayne State program stressed problems of the international political community; the Columbia Institute exposed teachers to legal, political and sociological questions affecting American liberties, while UCLA mixed an emphasis on politics as a process of conflict and accommodation with a briefer treatment of constitutional rights and liberties. Those who visited the institutes found an intense degree of enthusiasm among the teachers together with the usual individual disappointments and dissatisfactions.

Attitudes and Motivation

The predominant tone and content of remarks made by the participants (evident, too, in independent observations by both staff and consultants) indicated that the teachers were dramatically aware of their lack of preparation and were stimulated by exposure to the contemporary concerns of political science and modes of political analysis which the junk of outmoded textbooks, insufficient training, and archaic categories of description had hidden from them. There was also definite evidence that the teaching and administrative staffs associated with the institutes were themselves going through a learning process. Although some seemed originally to be attracted to the program as just another summer job, the interchange of ideas, the expression by some of the participants of their real problems with subject matter in the classroom, and the sense that all were partners in a positive but uncertain adventure, ended in producing a special kind of commitment to civic education on the part of many whose interest was marginal to begin with. This general atmosphere of enthusiasm and high

motivation was sustained in all programs, in spite of certain insufficiencies that were apparent in each.

Institute Program Deficiencies

1. Scheduling. Two or three of the institutes were overscheduled, and one was underscheduled. The tendency to try to fill the hours by scheduling lectures and activities, some of them marginal in importance, reduced the opportunities for reading and reflection and, to a lesser extent, random spontaneous discussions by the participants. In all of the institutes some time was available for this kind of activity but the sense of high priority for individual study was lacking. In the one institute where adequate time was allowed (UCLA), some of the free time could have been used for additional lectures and occasional small seminars dealing with the question of transfer of substance into the classroom. It is difficult to designate a cause for the over-scheduling. Certainly it is related to the sense of urgency that all directors and staff have regarding the need to make up lost time in training the teachers. It is also related no doubt, to a concern about the loss of control over program if most of the hours are not formally scheduled; certainly it is related to a tendency to second-guess the Office of Education and a purported desire of the agency that the schedule look busy on paper. Whatever the reason, a balance was only partially reached between lecture presentations, in which the participant tends to remain essentially passive, and the seminar or small group format where the student can be more active and will be more independent. Moreover, time for independent study in most of the institutes was crowded out by program; a key deficiency because the expectation was that the institutes were designed to stimulate fresh and independent work in the teachers career. The opportunity to start in this direction was not always available to the participants in their crowded days.

2. Utilization of Literature. In each institute there was imaginative use of the latest materials in political science but in no case was there adequate attention given to the growing literature and investigation related to political socialization itself. The literature in this field is growing rapidly and could have been put to more effective use. In brief, the teachers should have been made more aware of the social, personal, cultural forces which converge on a student to produce a spectrum of attitudes toward freedom, government and the like.

3. Transfer and Translation. Not surprisingly, the problem of transfer and translation was imperfectly approached in every case and we will have more to say about this below. But, it should be emphasized at this point that the supposition that this is a problem easily handled by means of mechanical tricks or of some kind of mysterious mix between "political scientists" and "educationists" is sheer self-deception. This fact bothered the participants as much as anything and more often than not the likelihood of successful transfer was dealt with as an act of faith.

4. Books. Ready access to pertinent books was lacking in almost every case, either because there were insufficient copies or because the borrowing library concept did not take hold.

5. Staff Articulation. Except in the case of one institute, the articulation between visiting lecturers and the ongoing staff was voluntary.

Problem of Translation

There was a real sense of pendency or incompleteness apparent in each of the institutes. In a larger sense this was produced by the students being suddenly immersed in exciting material, material without a beginning or an end as it related to their teaching, which left one with the impression that together with their sense of having gained a great deal, they were also asking the question "what happens to us now?" It also related to that part of the institute format which gives no room for meaningful followup, which does not make programmatic allowance for continuing education.

Importance of Realistic Programming

All of the applications and the plans of operation for the pilot institutes were ambitious in their expectations and excessive in their language. This results partly from the alleged art of writing grant requests but it seems to us that it is a symptom of something more, namely, that no clear estimate has been made of what can be accomplished realistically in the time available under the present institute pattern. It also shows the absence of a systematic assessment of program input in the way of coherent reading assignments, congruency of teaching and reading within the program and the attention to the problem of transfer related to the other two. The expansive nature of the grant proposals is, then, tied to the unanswered question of what qualities or inputs over what period of time with a given arrangement of students will produce outputs which, in regard to desirability, are themselves not clear. The process of teaching teachers political science for application in the classroom should not and cannot be put in a straightjacket of overcategorization (where in an archaic sense it is now). On the other hand, institute directors should have a better idea of where they are going and how they expect to get there. It seems highly desirable they make a realistic estimate in advance of what the institute might accomplish and how this might be done.

II. PROPOSALS FOR ADJUSTMENTS IN FUTURE PROGRAMS

The following proposals should be viewed in the very positive context of staff and participant enthusiasm, which was so evident in the pilot programs in 1966. Some of the proposals should be relatively easy to effectuate; others are more difficult.

Continuing Education

There should be no restrictions on repeaters, rather every effort should be made to see that those who are interested and qualified and who have had one institute experience should be encouraged to have another.

Together with this a serious effort should be made to program and fund a continuing institute on at least a pilot basis, for those who are qualified and interested. Such an institute might utilize the following pattern. First, the teachers would attend a six-week institute during the summer to begin their exposure to the substance of political science and to face up to the problems of articulation in the classroom. The teachers would carry with them from the institute a reading list for their own attention and some common program of tentative application of what they learned in the classroom. Two conferences would be established during the year to enable the teachers to gather and exchange information and to discuss the reading that they have done in the ensuing period. Another summer institute might then be held during the following summer to make certain that the teachers had experienced a real shift in their approach to the subject matter instead of merely heaping new information into an old framework. One possible method of selection would be to choose the most qualified institute participants of the previous summer as resource people for the new beginning group the following summer. But they should also be given the opportunity to meet as a group on their own.

Institute Distribution

The institutes should be distributed by subject matter within a given geographical region. This has two dimensions. First, there should be an arrangement of institutes, each dealing with a specific subject matter such as international relations, political processes, area studies or comparative government, etc. There should also be distribution by grade level with a heightened emphasis on encouraging programs at the elementary level. There are no barriers in the minds of children at the elementary level which preclude the introduction of sophisticated civics materials. Furthermore, the teachers themselves should have a choice of subject matter and the opportunity to be exposed to some coherent phase of the sub-disciplines of political science.

Book Allowance

The participants should be given allowances to purchase several important books in the field of political science, including but not restricted to the books to be used in the institute. We make this recommendation for two reasons: first, the compressed time span in the institute means that it is difficult for them to get the books they need when they need them. Also, it is essential to build a library in the home or classroom of the participant for reference and for continuing stimulation. The fact that a participant could begin to build a personal library with institute assistance might serve as a certificate of accomplishment and, hopefully, a continuing commitment to inquiry.

Problem of Translation

1. Barriers. It is evident that the problem of translation of material into the classroom is notably complex and difficult. It involves much more than the teaching "techniques." We are convinced that the imaginative

teacher will build his own system, given the opportunity to learn the subject matter, to exchange ideas with his fellow teachers, and to be exposed to individualized advice from education specialists and political science experts alike. But, even the imaginative teacher has several barriers to overcome.

a. It is evident that many of the educationists need and desire systematic exposure to the substance of political science if they are ever to help teachers of civics transfer political science material and insights into the classroom. In the same way political scientists should be exposed to some of the problems of application which they tend to ignore at the present time. This problem must be faced up to realistically. One possible way of handling it would be to encourage greater attendance by education specialists at the substantive meetings and by political scientists at the sessions devoted to pedagogy. Another would be to have regular staff meetings (perhaps including a few institute participants) to discuss the relations between substance and pedagogy in specific application to the current work of the institute.

b. The teachers themselves tend to be mired down in old patterns. As a result, the question of transfer is vitally related to the possibilities of stimulating over a period of time a decisive change in the direction of a teacher's subject matter competence. There is no reason to delude teachers into thinking that their teaching will be more than marginally improved by pouring a little information, gathered at a single institute session, on top of insufficient curriculum approaches and patterns of the past.

2. Goals. One difficulty which must be faced up to regarding political science (a difficulty, we might add, that contributes to the vitality of the field) is that political scientists themselves are hard put to agree on just what should be transferred. There does seem to be, at least, basic agreement on a minimum list of goals.

a. A capacity to define and understand the basic terms related to the use of political power in the contemporary world, or simply, an awareness of terminology used by political scientists;

b. An awareness of the methods used in analyzing political things;

c. An appreciation of the need for the most accurate possible acquisition and use of information;

d. Presumably pervading all others, an appreciation of the value of inquiry itself, together with an equal appreciation in discussing things political of the complexity, the ambiguity, and the tentativeness of findings;

e. To stimulate in the teacher and student alike a self-generating interest in the observation of political events and questions;

f. Teachers should be aware of a responsibility to convey what is really happening politically and to face directly with the students the value conflicts involved, while at the same time projecting a conviction about the legitimacy and worth of the demoractic political system in which these conflicts take place.

3. Variables. The question of translation related to the socio-economic, as well as the grade level of the students. While the teachers know this, this major variable was seldom discussed as such in any systematic way in the institutes.

4. Administrative Acceptance. Translation as every teacher knows, particularly but not alone in civics, relates to administrative acceptance in a given school and the imaginativeness and flexibility of curriculum planners. We strongly recommend that some of these important figures in the educational process be systematically included in future programs. We suspect that in many cases these individuals are used as scapegoats by the teachers to rationalize their own inability to transfer the materials into the classroom. On the other hand, there is no doubt that administrators and other curriculum authorities would benefit from uninhibited exposure to the teacher's problems, just as the teachers would benefit from learning some of the real problems of administrative application. Of course, this is quite apart from the fact that these key figures would benefit from exposure to a substance of political science.

5. Interchange. We believe that it is highly desirable to have some continuing interchange between the directors of the various institutes. In each of the pilot institutes interesting and significant experiments were begun and bothersome insufficiencies were experienced. In the case of the pilot institutes as in the case of future institutes, the directors should be given the opportunity to exchange insights and information. The process would directly benefit the directors and indirectly benefit the participants in matters related to the mechanics of administering an institute but, more importantly, the total problem of introducing new subject matter into the schools.

III. NEED FOR HARD DATA

There are other thorny issues which we believe should be raised. It is unsettling to acknowledge that for all our concern with civic education and with all of the funds spent and to be spent we have no hard data on the scope of the problem. There is no definite measure of the quality of preparation, either on an individual or a group basis, of the participants in the summer institutes. Furthermore, there are no hard data relating to the preparation or lack of preparation of teachers of civics in the nation at large. We just know from observation that most are poorly prepared and in many cases eager for new learning. As the gap begins to close, and, in order to close it further, an attempt must be made to design some measure of competence if at all possible.

IV. FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

We would like to observe also that the institute activity is highly beneficial but in conception is unsound if it limits teachers to a limited six weeks of study. We have already pointed out that the institute idea must

encompass continuing education. We have also suggested that the institute idea must reach out to other than teachers, extending itself to curriculum authorities, teachers of teachers where and if they can be identified, possibly even to textbook editors, and others. The image of the institute as a one-shot affair should be changed. Finally, we must emphasize again that beyond the question of subject matter competence, and the techniques and artistry associated with teaching ability, institutes should be encouraged to add a third dimension, namely, both an interest and a competence in the process of political socialization, especially where that process encourages or discourages democratic attitudes and attributes in the child and the student. There is much debate of what those attitudes and attributes might be but the teacher should be made aware of the rapidly accumulating findings in the social sciences which precede, follow, accompany and affect the process of civic education in the schools.

A different order of questions relate to the matter of participant selection for institutes. Greater attention might be given to queries like the following: Should institute participants represent a sample of school teachers? Or should they be drawn from one specific group? If so, which group? Should they have a good background in the subject matter of the institute? Or should they be largely uninformed on this subject? Greater attention might well be given to the question of whether participants for certain institutes might not be purposely selected from among teachers with extremely weak backgrounds rather than from comparatively well-qualified teachers.

V. QUANTITATIVE DATA

No meaningful quantitative data were available for use in this analysis.

In the future every effort should be made to build a complete profile of the participants, including age distribution, racial distribution, the ratio between administrators and teachers, the educational background as it relates to civics and the years of experience in teaching civics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 1966 CONPASS REPORTS

The following list constitutes the bibliography, to date, of reports on assessment of the 1966 NDEA Title XI and Arts and Humanities programs of the U.S. Office of Education by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs:

Axelrod, Joseph, FROM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TO PROFESSIONAL TEACHER, An Assessment of NDEA Institutes for Undergraduates Preparing to Become Elementary or Secondary Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, 1967, 66 pp., Tables, Appendices.

Brown, Donald J. and James W. Brown, EFFECTS OF SPECIAL MEDIA INSTITUTE PROGRAMS UPON THE BEHAVIOR OF TITLE XI NDEA INSTITUTE DIRECTORS (English, History, Geography, Reading, Modern Foreign Languages, and School Library Personnel), Department of Audiovisual Instruction (National Education Association) for CONPASS, 1966, 72 pp., Tables, Appendix.

Gray, Donald J., REPORT ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES INSTITUTES OF 1966, 1966, 27 pp., Tables.

The above report was based in part on visitation reports by Grose Evans, Curator, Extension Services, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; John F. Latimer, Classics Department, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; John F. Morrison, Dean, College of Fine Arts, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio; and Lee Rigsby, Director, School of Music, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Hackett, F.D., J.A. Schad, and R.E. Stake, REPORT ON THE SUMMER 1966 INDUSTRIAL ARTS INSTITUTES, 1966, 17 pp., Tables.

Hook, J.N., NDEA INSTITUTES FOR TRAINERS OF TEACHERS (SUMMER, 1966), 1966, 82 pp., Appendix, Tables.

Longaker, Richard, and Robert Cleary, REPORT ON EVALUATION OF PILOT CIVICS INSTITUTES, NDEA 1966, 1966, 7 pp.

Reese, Jim E. and Robert L. Darcy, REPORT ON THE 1966 NDEA ADVANCED STUDY INSTITUTES IN ECONOMICS, 1966, 25 pp., Tables, Appendix.

Shugrue, Michael F., Carl A. Barth, and Leo Ruth, AN EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ENGLISH INSTITUTE MATERIALS CENTER CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN NDEA SUMMER INSTITUTES IN ENGLISH, 1966, Tables, Appendices.

van Teslaar, A.P., REPORT ON THE JOINT EUROPEAN-UNITED STATES NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, MANNHEIM-HEIDELBURG, 30 June-24 August 1966, 1967, 19 pp., Appendix.